

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.weylo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/553,984	10/20/2005	Hideo Sato	273868US6PCT	1022	
22850 OBLON, SPIX	7590 06/19/200 /AK, MCCLELLAND	EXAM	EXAMINER		
1940 DUKE STREET			KING, JOHN B		
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2435			
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			06/19/2009	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com oblonpat@oblon.com jgardner@oblon.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/553,984	SATO, HIDEO	
Examiner	Art Unit	
John B. King	2435	

	John B. King	2435				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 08 June 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	LLOWANCE.				
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of th application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places th application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (vilt appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 4.1.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:						
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Is Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	on.			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply re-seved by the Office later may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.794(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL.	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1: tension and the corresponding amount of thortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropri- nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee te action; or (2) as			
2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the				
The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to (a) They raise new issues that would require further council (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belot) They are not deemed to place the application in bet	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);				
appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1		ected claims.				
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).						
7. X For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		be entered and an e	xplanation of			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).						
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary.	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appear and was not earlier presented. Se	ll and/or appellant fail se 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a).			
 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. ☐ The request for reconsideration has been considered but 		•				
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. ☑ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)					
/Kimyen Vu/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2435						

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The claim limitations of the first and second signals being "analog signal" and the encryption key information being "unique to the imaging unit" was not present in the original claims and will require further searching and consideration.

Continuation of 13. Other: Additional claim limitations were added that will require further search and consideration (See NOTE Above). The amended claims 1, 2, 6, 7, and 11 are also still unclear and indefinite. In applicants arguments, applicant states that A/D conversion and hamming distance are well known in the art. The Examiner agrees that these features are well known in the art, but the claims and specification do not state HOW the A/D conversion or hamming distance is being used to generate a key. It merely states that they are used to generate a key, but not HOW or WHY they are used to generate a key but not HOW or WHY they are used to generate a key but not HOW or WHY they are used to generate a key.

Also, applicants remarks on page 8 state that "neither claim 2 or claim 7 recite performing the hamming distance between the image data and the evaluation patterns." when it does A the time of the previous action claim 2 recited "naing at least one calculated hamming distance of the image data and the different evaluation patterns." Applicant is also arguing that performing a hamming distance between timage data and the evaluation patterns is the same as performing the hamming distance between the variation patterns and the evaluation patterns are the same as performing the hamming distance between the variation patterns and the evaluation patterns. This seem to imply that the "image data" and the "variation patterns" are the same, but according to claim 1 this is clearly not the case.